



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
08/865,419	05/28/1997	STEPHEN B. AUGER	CLINK0002	8405

7590

12/21/2001

JAMES C. WRAY
1493 CHAIN BRIDGE ROAD
SUITE 300
MCLEAN, VA 22101

EXAMINER

EINSMANN, MARGARET V

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1751

DATE MAILED: 12/21/2001

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

AS-42

Notic of Aband nm nt	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	08/865,419	AUGER, STEPHEN B.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Margaret Einsmann	1751	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address--

This application is abandoned in view of:

1. ☐ Applicant's failure to timely file a proper reply to the Office letter mailed on _____.
 - (a) ☐ A reply was received on _____ (with a Certificate of Mailing or Transmission dated _____), which is after the expiration of the period for reply (including a total extension of time of _____ month(s)) which expired on _____.
 - (b) ☐ A proposed reply was received on _____, but it does not constitute a proper reply under 37 CFR 1.113 (a) to the final rejection.
(A proper reply under 37 CFR 1.113 to a final rejection consists only of: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114).
 - (c) ☐ A reply was received on _____ but it does not constitute a proper reply, or a bona fide attempt at a proper reply, to the non-final rejection. See 37 CFR 1.85(a) and 1.111. (See explanation in box 7 below).
 - (d) ☐ No reply has been received.

2. ☐ Applicant's failure to timely pay the required issue fee and publication fee, if applicable, within the statutory period of three months from the mailing date of the Notice of Allowance (PTOL-85).
 - (a) ☐ The issue fee and publication fee, if applicable, was received on _____ (with a Certificate of Mailing or Transmission dated _____), which is after the expiration of the statutory period for payment of the issue fee (and publication fee) set in the Notice of Allowance (PTOL-85).
 - (b) ☐ The submitted fee of \$_____ is insufficient. A balance of \$_____ is due.
The issue fee required by 37 CFR 1.18 is \$_____. The publication fee, if required by 37 CFR 1.18(d), is \$_____.
 - (c) ☐ The issue fee and publication fee, if applicable, has not been received.

3. ☐ Applicant's failure to timely file corrected drawings as required by, and within the three-month period set in, the Notice of Allowability (PTO-37).
 - (a) ☐ Proposed corrected drawings were received on _____ (with a Certificate of Mailing or Transmission dated _____), which is after the expiration of the period for reply.
 - (b) ☐ No corrected drawings have been received.

4. ☒ The letter of express abandonment which is signed by the attorney or agent of record, the assignee of the entire interest, or all of the applicants.

5. ☒ The letter of express abandonment which is signed by an attorney or agent (acting in a representative capacity under 37 CFR 1.34(a)) upon the filing of a continuing application.

6. ☒ The decision by the Board of Patent Appeals and Interference rendered on _____ and because the period for seeking court review of the decision has expired and there are no allowed claims.

7. ☒ The reason(s) below:

See Continuation Sheet

Margaret Einsmann

Margaret Einsmann
Primary Examiner
Art Unit: 1751

Petitions to revive under 37 CFR 1.137(a) or (b), or requests to withdraw the holding of abandonment under 37 CFR 1.181, should be promptly filed to minimize any negative effects on patent term.

Item 7 - Other reasons for holding abandonment: The substitute appeal brief submitted 1/22/02 is defective as failing to provide arguments why each claim is separately patentable. Applicant has stated that the claims do not stand or fall together yet has not pointed out how each claim is patentable over each reference. Applicant was provided with a quotation from the MPEP in the notification of Non-compliance, paper #36, and a further explanation of what was missing in the second notice of non-compliance paper # 40, 12/21/2001. Applicant has failed to properly respond since a proper appeal brief has not been submitted within the extended period of time as allowed under 37 CFR 1.136(a) for submission of such brief.